



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CURRENT OPINION

Are We Entering an Era of Philosophy?

The philosophers who met last April in the Western Philosophical Association had their attention directed to the function of philosophy in reconstruction. A paper on the subject, read in part on that occasion, by Alfred H. Lloyd, of the University of Michigan, appears in the *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Method* for September 11. The article sustains the thesis that in the history of Christendom philosophy is now reaching its era of predominance. Till now it has been *ancilla* to theology, to mathematics and mechanics, to the biological sciences, and, of late, to psychology, anthropology, and sociology. Philosophy has at last won its freedom. Law, art, and science have in turn preceded philosophy in the progress of Christendom. Now the philosophical spirit is superseding the scientific. In the era of law, or institution-building, the institution sought strength and authority in the supernatural. In the era of art, the Renaissance, the institution became more candid toward the present world. In the recent era of science, the institution, formerly assertive and arbitrary, became only a means to an end. Christendom now seems, with the passing of dogmatism, to be entering the era of philosophy.

It is the triumph of the spirit of philosophy rather than that of its professional teachers that Professor Lloyd anticipates. By way of explanation of the spirit of philosophy, he asserts that philosophy is essentially reconstruction, in the sense of something more than a mere restoration. It may be expressed in terms of spirituality and of reality. "An era of philosophy is one ideally of resort to first principles and values, and materially, of the release of the elements."

The established order, frightened and resisting, finds itself between the two fires of the ideality of leisured thinkers, and the force of the agitated proletariat, both demanding a progressive reconstruction. Standpat conservatism is not less a danger than visionary idealism, and safety can only come if conservatism yields. Only if the institutional life is controlled by the philosophic spirit will it survive the test.

In reply to the question, What is to be the philosophical *ism* of the age, Professor Lloyd offers a "mediate, sensuous realism." Men once said that the spiritual alone is real, later that the rational is real, and are saying now that the real is the sensible. This progression of thought represents not loss but gain, as when in the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation the spirit was made flesh. This sensuous realism must be mediate, in the sense of rational, subtle, and sophisticated rather than naïve, and it must be coupled with what the writer calls an immediate dualism. This is not the medieval metaphysical dualism, in which body and soul dwelt in a clothed and constrained life and were not intimate with each other. With the modern removal of the covering and protection of custom and institution, a virtually nude life stands before experience, and soul and body, the spiritual and the material, are become immanent in each other. The free life is a real and immediate struggle of body and soul.

Philosophy's task cannot be to translate its realism into anarchy. It must prove its heritage of self-control. For self-control, not less than vision, constitutes the thinker's power.

Moral Arguments for Theism

F. R. Tennant discusses "Recent Moral Arguments for Theism" in the *Edinburgh*

Review for July. The emphasis on moral proofs of the existence of God goes back to Kant. Like Hume before him, Kant found no proof of a God in nature apart from man. He grounded the belief in God on man's moral reason. Human morality has become the cornerstone of theistic theory in the view of many modern theists. But a change has taken place in the form of the argument presented. The new type of argument is not a simple and direct inference from morality to God, but proceeds indirectly, and with the inclusion of other than moral considerations. What is attempted is not a complete demonstration, but the establishment of probability in a degree higher than can be attained for any rival theory.

The older and direct arguments for theism from morality in man are briefly reviewed. To Kant God and immortality were necessary corollaries of the imperative of duty. Dr. Rashdall's *Theory of Good and Evil* (1907) makes a similar inference. The absolute moral ideal exists in some mind: there must be a divine mind in which it can exist. But this depends on the old ontological fallacy which makes the unwarranted transition from idea to existence. Other writers, like Alfred Russel Wallace and Arthur J. Balfour, have turned to theistic solutions to account for the higher moral nature of man for which they find no explanation in natural selection. But it is pointed out that as an organ may be developed in response to environment and then adapted to other uses than those for which it was specially evolved, so the human mind, reaching advanced development, may turn its acquired powers to activities which have no survival-value. Still another attempt is made to pass directly from morality to God, by the assumption that the world is a rational world and there is a connection between aspiration and fulfilment. Mr. Tennant regards this as based on an ambiguity. The world may

be rational in the sense of being intelligible, without being teleologically ordered.

The more indirect moral arguments make man, in the language of Professor Pringle-Pattison, "organic in the world." Huxley, observing the cruelties of nature, said that the cosmos was no school of virtue. But it is the very hardships caused by nature that have given man his morality. Ethical principles have to do with the bodily impulses of hunger and sex. So the cosmos, which has been regarded as anti-moral, is really of instrumental moral value. The tree is to be judged not by its roots but by its fruits. Nature and man are not at strife, but organically one.

Again, the processes of evolution reveal a purpose. The teleological argument has been respected even by Hume and Kant. To Professor Sorley "the process which led to organic and purposive life was itself animated by purpose." This purpose within the cosmos is described in the statement, "Nature is a school of morality."

The conclusion that the purpose of the universe is moral leads the writer to theistic belief. This view makes it possible to look with equanimity upon the existence of evil. A "good" world may not mean a hedonically pleasant one, but one adapted to the achievement of morality. If the world exists for the realization of moral values, physical evil is the by-product of evolution, and moral evil is a *sine qua non* of moral goodness.

The respective claims of pantheism and of pluralism, rival antitheistic theories, are subjected to criticism on their moral implications. Pantheism has no room either for human freedom or for a world-purpose: it "explains away rather than explains the antithesis between what is and what ought to be." The pluralist view accounts indeed for the confused conflict of the world, but it fails to account for the prevalence of order which obtains despite these conflicts.

Order points to purpose, while morality implies freedom. Neither monism nor pluralism avails to interpret these facts, which have a meaning only for theism. In seeking the explanations of what is in what ought to be, we are on the most reasonable ground yet offered by philosophy. Morality points to the theistic idea as necessary to the rounding off of our knowledge of the world.

The Fetters of Bibliolatry

W. Garrett Horder heads his discussion of "The Fetter on Protestantism" in the *Hibbert Journal* for July with a pregnant quotation from Thomas à Kempis: "The Holy Spirit has liberated me from a multitude of opinions." Protestantism, he asserts, has been fettered to a book, while Catholicism has been fettered to a church; but inasmuch as the latter may change and the former knows no alteration, Catholicism has at least theoretically a possibility of movement which Protestantism has not. The progressive Protestant teacher is hindered in his work by the clamors of those who want "a whole Bible," and the progress of truth is retarded by the still prevailing bibliolatry of Protestantism. This situation is not due to the book itself, which provides safeguards against it, but is the result of misinterpretation. St. Paul and Jesus did not assert these claims for the Book which are made tests of the faith by many today. This doctrine of the final authority of Scripture has been the cause of untold anxiety to earnest people. While the real problems of religion lie in nature and in man, many have been exercising themselves about difficult texts. Dr. Horder testifies from the experience of a long ministry that the perplexities people are asking to have solved have to do with Scripture passages, and arise on the assumption of infallibility in the written instead of in the living word within. The "Diary of a Church-goer,"

written by Lord Courtney, is cited as an example of the ethical revolt against unedifying passages of Scripture which were read in church as if they constituted ultimate authority.

The terrible "decrees" of the Westminster Confession are based on Romans, chapter 8, where Paul is reflecting rabbinical notions, out of which he elsewhere escapes. People suffer from the reading of such passages when they exalt the written word above the inward spirit. Christ did not write and never promised his followers a book. He continually promised them a spirit. He did not originate the spirit, but when he was departing from his followers he threw them back upon that inward energy which had always been in operation. His presence outwardly could not go on forever, but this normal process of the spirit could go on forever.

The New Testament is the first-fruits of the spirit in the church. But its record of facts and their sequence below the plane of inspiration. Its inspiration consists of those deeper elements of insight by which the facts are made to flash out upon us their spiritual meaning. In this sense the Bible is the *fons et origo* of our faith. But the close of the Canon is not the close of inspiration, any more than the end of the classic period marks the conclusion of all literature. Modern men have experienced the same types of inspiration as the Hebrew prophets. The New Testament is not an end but a beginning.

The failure to recognize this has cost the church the losses incident to the struggle between science and religion. If the church had not preferred the statements of Genesis to those which the Creator wrote in the strata of the earth, its influence today would have been much wider and deeper.

Jesus was so wise as not to ordain a book, but to commit his kingdom to the guidance of the spirit.

The Rapprochement of Judaism and Christianity

That able representative of liberal Judaism, Claude G. Montefiore, in a lecture to soldiers on "Modern Judaism," published in the *Hibbert Journal* for July, pleads for a mutual recognition between Judaism and Christianity as "kindred pathways to common goals." He endeavors to dispel some of the causes of the misunderstanding of Judaism by Christians. There are, he finds, three common mistakes about Judaism, all with some color of fact to support them, but mistakes, nevertheless. One is that Judaism consists of a lot of practices without beliefs. A Jew who so interprets his religion is one from whom the true spirit of Judaism is departed. Another misjudgment is regarding the Jew's faith in the Old Testament. But it must be asked: To what in the Old Testament, with all its variety, is modern Judaism vitally related? It is not vitally related to everything in the Old Testament, good, bad, and indifferent. Nor has it stopped short with the Old Testament and confined its religion to what is there contained. For instance, the Old Testament has no doctrine, only late hints, of a future life. But modern Judaism inherits this belief from the period before Christ subsequent to the latest Old Testament books. Indeed, Christianity seems to have retained more of the lower and primitive conceptions of Old Testament religion than has Judaism, e.g., that of blood atonement. The selection of the highest elements of Old Testament religion and the rejection of the baser ones characterize both orthodox and liberal Judaism today.

Further, modern Judaism has a definite kinship with Christianity. This is due for one reason to the fact that the hero of the gospel was a Jew, and his teaching was Judaism. His Judaism rose above the Old Testament average, but so does that of the modern Jew, who has no opposition to

offer to the criticisms made by Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount. The church, on its part, has never let the Old Testament go. It has suffered from Old Testament ideas of the supernatural, e.g., in the burning of witches, but it has gained through the social message of the prophets and the piety of the Psalter. The Christian literature of England has been profoundly influenced by the Old Testament.

The doctrine of God of modern Judaism and that of Christianity are very similar, notwithstanding the trinitarian form of Christian theology. Ethically the two are essentially the same. The differences on salvation, and on the relation of love and righteousness in God have been over-emphasized. They offer a common ideal of human action. Judaism is not a system of injunctions and prohibitions. The Pentateuch is not the Law, but its symbol, to the modern Jew—the symbol of what Wordsworth worshiped in his "Ode to Duty." Jews should not regard Christianity as false where it differs from their position, nor should Christians believe that Judaism was a mere preparation for Christianity which is now superseded. Let each regard the other as a living religion, contributing to the religious synthesis of the future.

The Primate of Sweden Discusses a Supernational Church

Archbishop Soderblom of Upsala, Primate of Sweden, proposes a supernational church in a contribution to the *Contemporary Review* for September. He addresses himself to the problem of recovering the unity lost at the Reformation. The medieval theocracy was succeeded by sovereign states and nations. This was a necessary development, but not final. A larger unity with the subordination of each part to the whole must now be worked out, or civilization will be lost in the mutual destruction of its component parts. National life was

an important stage, furthering culture and fostering delicate inner peculiarities. Evil influences entered in and changed the kindly home, once freely open to all honest guests and good neighbors, into a school of self-sufficiency, or an ambush craftily prepared with hostile intent.

The church has been infected by nationalism, at times succumbing to the temptation of setting up the supremacy of the temporal community and its policy as idols to be worshiped. Consequently the national churches have fallen largely into ill repute. Yet they have done much in the sphere of religion and compare favorably with either Rome or democratic Congregational units.

But the church's mission is supernatural and its note must be universal. During the awful struggle of the world-war millions of souls have clung to the thought of a community of mankind in right and justice as to a plank of safety on a sea of despair. Now the supernatural code of justice is being warped by weakness and passion, and by the power of mammon. Christianity alone can strengthen the bonds of brotherhood and unity among the nations.

In order, however, to unite the nations the church must first of all bring about the unity of its own various sections. The organization must also find a common channel of utterance for Christianity generally. Rome has invited all to enter into the fold and thus make for Catholicity. But spiritual freedom cannot make such a sacrifice for outward institutional unity. There must be an evangelical Catholicity which will allow the various religious communities to retain their creeds and organizations undisturbed, but at the same time serve and strengthen the cause of spiritual unity, each different section making its own contribution to the common heritage of faith, worship, and the ideal of life and of the future.

The archbishop proposes an ecumenical council representing the whole of Christen-

dom, so constructed that it can speak on behalf of Christendom, guiding, warning, strengthening, praying, in the common religious, moral, and social matters of mankind. It should be composed partly by the appointment of men specially qualified, partly by election on broad democratic lines. This ecumenical council should not be invested with any external authority, but should have and gain its influence according to the degree in which it was able to act as a spiritual power. It should speak, not *ex cathedra*, but from the depths of the Christian conscience.

The Greatest of These Is Conscience

Edward Farwell Hayward, in the *Harvard Theological Review* for July, has a worth-while contribution to the literature of religious criticism, under the title "The Reconstruction in Religion." Religion has been and, Mr. Hayward believes, will continue to be mediated by an institution. The church, like man himself, has three sides to its nature, the intellectual or dogma, the spiritual or devotion, and the bodily or discipline. In all three of these there has been constant development, but this has been mainly noticeable in dogma. Dogma is like a cornerstone which has been buried out of sight. Calvinism, Wesleyanism, or Unitarianism have ceased to suggest a scheme of doctrines, and now signify an atmosphere or climate of the soul, which we may find congenial or otherwise. The readjustments of the age are making for a simplification of Christ's teachings. Race and nation cease to be dividing lines. What hope is left for denominationalism founded upon difference of opinion?

Theology is not so important as the emotions it helps to create. What is needed is not only a new theology but a new kind of theology, "a theology which exists as a fertile soil for the fruits of the spirit." Dogma does not offer any obstruction, when with Francis G. Peabody we

regard faith as a way of walking rather than a way of talking. The spirit of liberal religion has been vindicating itself in the war, where rabbi, priest, and minister shared in religious tasks.

In the adjustments of the future, worship and discipline will have to be considered as well as theology. These demands have not been so far met by Liberalism. Unitarianism has, it is true, produced choice hymns, but it has not evolved a devotional life comparable to its intellectual strength. It must learn to move people, "and the pathway to the motive is the emotive." The church must pass from the higher criticism which has too long engaged its attention to the higher creation which is now possible. To obtain a richer worship High Church parties appear in Unitarianism both in England and in America.

But while beauty of worship is surely needed, what is needed still more is a rehabilitation of conscience. A French soldier has pointed out, in criticism of the church, that the army does not spend its time speculating about its military duties. One of the things made clear by recent events is the need of a new moral imperative. In free America a national conscience has been born, due largely to the patient work of the church in days gone by. Yet the individual conscience has broken down. Men have used the church as they used the state, to get what they could out of it. But as in the state so in the church there are latent possibilities of a new discipline. Conscience must be defined in terms of social responsibility. Conscience, as hitherto understood, has made cowards and community slackers of many. There must arise a new religious conscience to match the civil conscience that has been evoked by the war. The church must concentrate all her energies on the moral call to arms. "Till conscience is enthroned again it is useless to reconstruct theology or to enrich worship or to revive religion."

Irresponsible Open-mindedness

In a satirical article by Frank Jewett Mather, Jr., in the *Unpartisan Review* for July-September, 1919, it is charged that the present generation, while intent upon "proving all things," is regardless of "holding fast that which is good." The open-mindedness which characterizes a type of radical publication and is affected by the youth of today is directed only toward the future and is neglectful of the past. There is no recognition of human achievements in the past and no charity for humanity's past shortcomings. The only resource possessed by modern youth is the conviction that the past has been all wrong and that the future will be all right. The only program is one of demolition; there is no positive plan. Indeed, on the sweeping away of the past, the future will, in this view, take care of itself, since the new generation will possess the new social mind. Expectancy becomes the guide of life.

The mind, so ostentatiously open, reveals itself on search to be equally empty, and this not from lack of intelligence but from choice. It is consciously kept empty to preserve its openness. The new ideas entertained find no older ones present to attach themselves to. Where there are no principles or prejudices there is no test for new ideas. It is a condition of progress that the mind should contain something that is valued with which the value of new views may be compared. To mock or ignore the travails of mankind for countless years is monstrous inhumanity, like the behavior of children fox-trotting a week after their father's death.

Mr. Mather regards the present-day open-mindedness as a degraded form of the dilettantism of the previous generation. "The professionally open-minded person of today is noisy, fretful, hasty, and wholly uncivilized. His fickleness he vaunts as a virtue and he respects nothing but the day after tomorrow."